

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
PART II
SOLICITATION F05604-01-R-9004

1. In accordance with Part IV, Section L-27.g.(1)(A) and (2)(C), the Position Descriptions, Scenarios (A&B), and responses to Questions (C) are not included in the 130 page count limitation for Volume II, Technical Performance Proposal. Are the Training Plan (including a copy of the proposed Training Record), Contingency Plan, Quality Control Plan, and any other Plans that may be page intensive included as part of the 130 page count limitation? Can they be added as attachments and not included in the 130 page count limitation? Please clarify.

ANSWER: The Training Plan and the Quality Control Plan will not be included in the 130 page count limitation for the Volume II, Technical Performance Proposal. The Contingency Plan will remain included in the page limitation. See Amendment 01 for further clarification.

2. Part IV, Section L27.c.(1) states: "Request Volume I, Chapter 1, Past Performance documentation be delivered to the address shown below NO LATER THAN 3 P.M., prevailing Colorado time, 29 March 2002, but NO LATER THAN 05 April 2002", Are you wanting the entire Volume I, Past Performance, NLT 29 March 2002, or just Chapter 1? The statement says "Volume I, Chapter 1, but it's difficult to determine which section of Volume 1 is Chapter 1. Also, are you saying in the above statement that Volume 1 can be delivered as late as 05 April 2002? Please clarify.

ANSWER: Volume I is Chapter 1—reference the Table in L-27e. The Volume I Past Performance is requested NLT 29 March 2002. The key word is requested. If it is not received until 5 Apr 02 with the rest of the proposal, there is no penalty to the offeror.

3. The chart depicted in Part IV, Section L-27.e. indicated "VOLUME, NUMBER OF COPIES, CHAPTERS, TITLE, and PAGE COUNT." What is the significance of the column titled "CHAPTERS" and how are they to be incorporated into the volumes?

ANSWER: Volume and Chapter correlate with each other. Chapter 1 is Volume 1—Past Performance, Chapter 2 is Volume II -- Technical Performance Proposal, Chapter 3 is Volume III – Price/Cost Proposal, and Chapter 4 is Volume IV—Proposal Documentation.

4. With the Technical as Pass/Fail and not color coded, it is a lot of work to put together up to 130 pages plus the PD's and Scenarios and answer the questions. It almost looks like an IFB. Would you consider changing to Blue, Green, Yellow, and Red and that way you get the best contractor technically and price wise. That would allow for a better evaluation under BEST VALUE, Performance Price Tradeoff Policy and Procedures.

*ANSWER: The solicitation is structured as a Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT), in accordance with Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation supplement (AFFARS) Part 5315.101-1(a) which "permits tradeoffs between price/cost and the past performance evaluation for technically acceptable proposals...In PPT, tradeoffs do not occur on a basis of technical merit, but on the basis of the comparative assessment of offerors' past performance information and price/cost." In a PPT, the **technical proposal** cannot earn a higher rating than "passing." Assigning color ratings to technical proposal evaluations in a PPT solicitation process does not comply with Air Force regulations.*

5. I noticed in Question #9 (Q&A posted with the RFP) that only the 2nd part but I didn't see a reply to aircraft in AWP status. The answer would lead you to assume AWP was part of the NMCS answer. Please clarify.

ANSWER: The question, as written, appears incomplete. However, if the question is asking whether the AWP is part of the NMCS, the response to this question is, "Yes". An aircraft in NMCS or AWP status is considered NMC.

6. We respectfully request an extension of 15 days from the current due date of April 5, 2002 to April 19, 2002. We request this extension due to the fact that the solicitation released on March 6, 2002 has substantial changes from the draft RFP requirements. An additional 15 days would allow us to adjust to the very significant modifications as well as the new requirements and submit a compliant and competitive proposal.

*ANSWER: No extension to the RFP closing is granted. The Government's requirement, as outlined in the final Statement of Work, did not alter significantly from the **draft** version of the Statement of Work previously released on 29 Oct 2001. Extensions to RFP closing dates cannot be made to accommodate any one particular offeror and the 30 day response time established in the final, released, solicitation appears reasonable and in keeping with the Federal Acquisition Regulation 5.203(c) and standard Air Force policy.*

7. Regarding snow removal. In Attachment 1, paragraph 1.2.1.15, on page 37, the Government states that it shall provide "snow removal equipment". Additionally, as such, in Appendix 6, page 85, the shaded area shown for the 54 HF requires snow removal. Yet in Appendix 8, page 101, the Government only calls out for providing snow blowers for the 37 HF @ Warren and the 40 HF @ Malmstrom. I would assume that the 54 HF @ Minot would get more snow than either the 37th or the 40th. Is the Government going to provide a snow blower for the 54th or is that going to be contractor provided?

ANSWER: The Government unit at Minot (54th HF) owns a bobcat with a snowblower attachment that is available for contractor use on an "as needed" basis for snow removal; but, this equipment is also used by the Government. Therefore, the bobcat with the snowblower attachment is not furnished primarily to the contractor.

8. Should FAR Clause 52.228-3 be incorporated into the solicitation?

ANSWER: Based on the definition in FAR 28.305, the clause is not applicable and should not be incorporated into the solicitation.

